

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 27, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by European Patent Application Publication EP 1 085 484 A2 to Nozaki.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection below. Claims 5 and 6 are currently pending. The current application amends claim 5. Claim 5 is the only independent claim.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nozaki. An anticipation rejection under § 102 is improper unless a single prior art reference shows or discloses each and every claim recitation.

Applicants' amended claim 5 recites a method of supporting a self-sustained moving comprising the steps of inputting physical disability information and a destination from a communication terminal, computing a guide route of a sidewalk according to the physical disability information based on the physical disability information inputted from the communication terminal and sidewalk data stored in a database, the sidewalk data correlating to the physical disability information, combining the computed guide route with a map data stored in the database to output it as an electronic map, and displaying the electronic map showing the guide route on the communication terminal, wherein the step of computing the guide route includes preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information.

Nozaki does not show or disclose each and every recitation of Applicants' amended claim 5. For example, Nozaki does not show or disclose inputting physical disability information, much less using physical disability information to compute a guide route, or sidewalk data correlating to physical disability information. Instead, Nozaki discloses route setting based on standard characteristics such as sex, age, character, hobby and preference, which is then used to set a route through facilities of interest. (See, e.g., Nozaki, paragraphs

[0016]-[0018].) These considerations are unrelated to physical disabilities, and are not used to compute a guide route based on physical disability information.

Additionally, Nozaki does not show or disclose preferentially computing the sidewalk that has been passed by a plurality of users having similar physical disability information. Instead, Nozaki's route setting appears to be based exclusively on information about the route, itself, such that there is no preference for a route previously used by users with similar characteristics. In fact, Nozaki expressly discloses:

Moreover, in the case in which the user is to specify the *same* two points again to set a route, he (she) can get an opportunity for a new discovery related to area information if a route *different* from the set route is set. (Nozaki, paragraph [0091]; emphasis added.)

The foregoing reveals that, if anything, Nozaki discloses its systems has a preference *against* setting a route previously used by users with similar characteristics.

Thus, Nozaki does not show or disclose each and every recitation of Applicants' amended claim 5. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nozaki is improper for at least this reason, and should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nozaki. Claim 6 depends directly from claim 5 and includes additional recitations thereto. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nozaki is improper for at least the same reasons stated in connection with claim 5, and should be withdrawn.

Having traversed each and every claim rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections be withdrawn, and claims 5 and 6 be passed to issue.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the current Amendment constitutes new matter. Amendments to claim 5 are supported by at least paragraphs [0001], [0030] and [0042] of the Specification.

Application No.: 10/519,859
Office Action dated: March 27, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: June 18, 2007

Applicants believe no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response. If any fees are deemed necessary, authorization is hereby granted to charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 13-0235.

Respectfully submitted,

By Marina F. Cunningham
Marina Cunningham
Registration No. 38,419
Attorney for the Applicant

McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
(860) 549-5290
Customer No.: 35301